available should at some time in the future a researcher find that the species represented is not conspecific with *arceuthophila* Mabille.

Comments on the proposed designation of *Scottia pseudobrowniana* Kempf, 1971 as the type species of *Scottia* Brady & Norman, 1889 (Crustacea, Ostracoda)
(Case 2896; see BZN **51**: 304–305)

(1) Henri J. Oertli
12 rue Lamartine, F-64320 Bizanos, France

There is not the slightest doubt about Prof Kempf's conclusion that *S. pseudobrowniana* was the original basis of the genus *Scottia*, and acceptance of his proposals by the Commission would be welcomed by ostracod workers.

(2) Support for the application has also been received from Drs Claude Meisch (*Musée d'Histoire Naturelle, Marché-aux-Poissons, L-2345 Luxembourg*) and I.G. Sohn (*National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A.*).

Comments on the proposed conservation of *Lironeca* Leach, 1818 (Crustacea, Isopoda) as the correct original spelling
(Case 2915; see BZN **51**: 224–226; **52**: 67–69)

(1) Giambattista Bello
Istituto Arion, C.P. 61, 70042 Mola di Bari, Italy

I wish to support the proposal by Williams & Bowman to conserve *Lironeca* as the correct original spelling of the name of a genus of parasitic isopods.

In addition to the arguments used in their application, with all of which I agree, I would like to stress that although zoological names can be arbitrary combinations of letters the vast majority do have a meaning. Workers have to remember hundreds of names, and they are greatly helped by this. The names may recall particular features of the taxa or their habitats, or be formed from geographical, personal or mythological names, or be evocative of vernacular names of the animals. The meaning of Leach's (1818) names for eight genera of isopods is quite clear: they are anagrams of the personal name Caroline or Carolina. *Livoneca*, on the contrary, has no meaning.

The intentions of Leach are evident, and the conservation of *Lironeca* is in perfect agreement with them. I maintain that whenever possible the original intention of the author of scientific names has to be respected.

(2) Robert Y. George
The University of North Carolina at Wilmington, 601 South College Road, Wilmington, North Carolina 28403–3297, U.S.A.

I have researched on isopod crustacea for nearly three decades, describing several new genera and many new species. On the basis of this experience I wish to support

Dr Bowman's application to conserve the spelling *Lironeca* Leach, 1818. Leach used anagrams of Carolina to coin the names of many flabelliferan isopod genera, and it is perfectly clear that *Livoneca* was simply a printer's error. Let us correct the spelling to *Lironeca* by acting positively in this case.

Comments on the proposal to remove the homonymy between BRACHYPTERINAE Erichson, [1845] (Insecta, Coleoptera) and BRACHYPTERINAE Zwick, 1973 (Insecta, Plecoptera), and proposed precedence of KATERETIDAE Ganglbauer, 1899 over BRACHYPTERINAE Erichson, [1845]
(Case 2865; see BZN 51: 309–311)

(1) P.A. Audisio
Dipartimento di Biologia Animale e dell'Uomo (Zoologia), Università degli Studi di Roma 'La Sapienza', Viale dell'Università 32, I-00185 Rome, Italy

1. My application, co-authored with Dr R. Fochetti and Prof Dr P. Zwick, seeks to remove the homonymy between the insect family-group names BRACHYPTERINAE Erichson, [1845] (Coleoptera) and BRACHYPTERINAE Zwick, 1973 (Plecoptera). I should like to clarify some points relating to the coleopteran name and to make a further proposal to the Commission.

2. Erichson (1843) divided the family NITIDULIDAE Latreille, 1807 into three groups, the NITIDULINAE, the CARPOPHILINAE, and the 'Cateretes'. This last group, which unlike the others was not referred to by a name with a family-group ending, comprised the genera *Brachypterus* Kugelann, 1794 and *Cercus* Latreille, 1796, but did not include *Kateretes* Herbst, 1793. Erichson commented that the group contained only two genera but that their species had hitherto been placed under three names; he allocated some of the species placed in *Kateretes* by Herbst (1793) to the other genera. Under Articles 11f(1) and 64 of the Code the name KATERETIDAE is not available from Erichson (1843), although it has been cited recently with this authorship and date by Silfverberg (1992, p. 49) and by one of us (Audisio, 1993, p. 781).

3. Erichson ([1845]) introduced the name BRACHYPTERINAE for the same subfamily, i.e. the two genera *Brachypterus* and *Cercus*. He now considered that, although Herbst's genus *Kateretes* included all sorts of beetles, it was based mainly on species of *Cis* Latreille, 1796 and was in no way related to *Brachypterus* and *Cercus* (a view not shared by later authors). He proposed that the name 'Cateretes' should be used for the *Cis* group. The name BRACHYPTERINAE Erichson, [1845] was used by several authors in the mid-19th century for a subfamily within the NITIDULIDAE but, with few exceptions (see Verhoeff, 1923, p. 9), has not been used since Marseul (1885, p. 19). It has not been used at all for more than 50 years.

4. The name CATERETINI was first made available by Ganglbauer (1899, p. 447) for a tribe of five genera which included *Kateretes* Herbst, 1793 (with *Cercus* cited as a synonym) and *Brachypterus*. Despite the seniority and previous usage of the name BRACHYPTERINAE, that of KATERETINAE (sometimes spelled CATERETINAE) was universally adopted and, until very recently, used for a subfamily within the NITIDULIDAE which included, with other genera, *Brachypterus* and *Kateretes*. The KATERETIDAE have lately been considered to be a family separate from the NITIDULIDAE (see